Approved For Release 2008/05/12: CIA-RDP89B00423R000200200013-8

Administration Figure 1967 Use Only DDI-64786-84

14 August 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR:	Associate Deputy	Director for Intellig	ence	
VIA :	Chief, East Euro	e of European Analysis pean Division Regional Branch		
FROM :	EU	IRA/EE/EW		25 X 1
SUBJECT :	Request Permissi	on to give Oral Presen	tation	
1. I reque problems in the	est permission to Balkans (see atta	give a talk on financi ched text).	al	
2. When ap	proved, I intend	to give the talk at th	e Annual	25X1
knowledge, class	the material in ified and I will	the oral presentation not engage in policy	is, to my	
4. employee but wil the views expres	l append the stan	will be identified as dard disclaimer indica d not necessarily thos	ting that	25X1
agency.	·	•		25 X 1
A * * * * A b * * * * * * * * * * * * *	Charles I			
			_	25 X 1
		2 0	AUG 1984	
Director, Office	of Eu ∀ opean Anal	ysis	Date	
APPRO				25 X 1
			AUG 1984	
Associate Deputy	Director for Int	elligence	Date	

Administrative - Internal Use Only

STAT

14 August 84

STAT

Financial Problems in the Balkans

I. Introduction

- A. Eastern Europe's debt crisis did not spare the Balkans.

 (Indeed, the rise of Romania's financial difficulties so soon after Poland's did much to weaken bankers' confidence.
- B. Yet crisis hit the three--Bulgaria, Romania, and Yugoslavia--much differently. (Albania not included in this talk as "foreign debt" is against the law.)
 - 1. The severity differed among the three.
 - 2. Different responses to the crisis.
 - a. By the regimes.
 - b. By private creditors.
 - Their reactions have different long-term implications.

II. <u>Romania</u>

- A. Its difficulties were only tangentially related to bankers' concerns about Poland. Romania had its own economic difficulties.
 - 1. Romania had growing arrearages in summer 1981.
 - 2. Coupled with growing percentage of short term debt. (estimated by some to be as high as 40-50 percent of a total debt of \$10 billion.)
 - 3. Also growing concern about the soundness of overall growth strategy--especially the continued pursuit

- of rapid growth based on energy intensive heavy industrialization.
- Soon bankers withdrew short-term credit lines,
 which intensified the liquidity problem.
- B. Romania was hurt by own responses.
 - Press reported that Romanians initially ignored problems or denied existence.
 - 2. Lack of information and data also did not help.
- C. By early 1982 it was forced to reschedule debts with both private and government creditors, although rescheduling with banks not completed until late 1982.
- D. Along with debt relief Bucharest imposed harsh austerity measures at home.
 - 1. Result was drop in consumption and very slow growth in industrial output (both fell to postwar lows).
 - But Bucharest generated large trade surpluses that helped pay down debts. (e.g. a \$1.5 billion deficit in 1980 turned into a \$1.5 billion surplus by 1982).
- E. 1983 was a repeat of 1982.
 - 1. Reschedulings were quicker, however.
 - Austerity continued at home to further reduce debt to about \$9 billion.
- F. Bucharest plans for further improvements on the financial front this year.
 - 1. Another large surplus forcasted.
 - 2. No rescheduling.

3. And doing so without an IMF program.

III. <u>Yugoslavia</u>

- A. Its problems arose only in small part due to bankers' pullout.
- B. Mostly due to own failure to control rising trade and current account deficits. (In 1979 had a \$7 billion dollar hard currency trade deficit. Its debt of around \$19 billion in 1981 was larger than Polands on either a per capita basis or as a percentage of GNP.)
 - To some extent these problems are the result of external factors--e.g. oil price hikes and Western recession and protectionism.
 - 2. But they are largely the result of ongoing decentralization.
 - a. Yet economy not free enough to ensure microeconomic efficiency.
 - b. And not enough authority in Belgrade to impose adequate stablization measures.
- C. Led to 1983 Western rescue package.
 - Worth over \$5 billion, involved 600 banks, 16 nations, IMF and BIS.
- D. Coupled with stabilization program at home (in conjunction with IMF program), which slowed growth markedly from the high growth rates of the 1970s.
- E. Result was to stabilize debt (only marginal growth), to cut trade deficit sharply (fell to well under \$2 billion in both 1982 and 1983), to generate first current

account surplus in over a decade, to slow growth of domestic economy.

- F. Nonetheless, more help needed in 1984.
 - Key hinged on completing IMF standby agreement--a one-year package worth \$400 million.
 - a. Negotiations harder than before.
 - b. Debate with Fund over pace of adjustment (like problem of many LDCs).
 - c. Fund wanted real interest rates, eliminination of a price freeze, exchange rate adjustments, and reduced subsidies to enterprises.
 - d. At one point Yugoslav officials publicly said they were willing to "go it alone" without financial assistance.
 - e. Compromise reached when Fund agreed to slow pace of adjustment.
 - f. Minor squabble still delayed first drawing.
 - 2. Other financial packages soon followed--government package worth \$800 million, and bank's worth \$1.2 billion.
- G. Belgrade continues austerity at home and now seeking multi-year refinancing package.

IV. Bulgaria

1 7 - 1 4 8 c

- A. For most part, unaffected by credit crunch.
- B. Few financial problems.
 - 1. Conservative borrowing strategy since mid-1970s.
 - 2. Massive reliance on Soviet trade.

- 3. Result was only minor reduction in bank exposure.
- C. Strong financial improvements continue this year.
 - Sofia continuing to run trade and current account surpluses to pay down debts.
 - Probably could borrow if wanted to given strong position.

V. <u>Long-Term Implications</u>

- A. On surface, Bulgaria looks best off while Yugoslavia looks the weakest.
 - 1. Yet <u>Bulgaria</u> counts heavily on continued Soviet support.
 - a. For 60% of trade, 2/3 of energy consumption.
 - But Soviet support showing signs of weakening (e.g. rising energy prices, reduced trade deficits, etc.)
 - c. And trade links with West not well established.
 - d. Much of recent hard currency surpluses come from resales of oil to developed West and sales of other goods to third world. Both show signs of weakening.
 - Romania's financial improvement due largely to draconian import cuts (over 40% in 1981-82) and maintaining large volume of oil product sales to Western Europe.
 - a. Questions remain as to how long import reductions can continue and whether exports

other than oil will pickup.

- b. Austerity at home the past three years also likely to slow future growth.
- c. Relief from debt reschedulings ends next year.
- 3. Yugoslavia's position is hard to get a handle on.
 - a. While still needing some debt relief, situation is improving.
 - b. Key is whether ongoing attempts at reforms can produce system which can generate enough exports to maintain creditworthiness in the long run.